

Exhibit 12

In re
CUSTOMS AND TAX ADMINISTRATION OF
THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK
(SKATTEFORVALTNINGEN) TAX REFUND
LITIGATION*

*This Report relates to all related dockets in *In re: Skat Tax Refund Scheme Litigation*, 1:18-md-2865.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
Civil Action No.18-MD-2865 (LAK)

Reply Expert Report

of
C. FREDERICK REISH
1800 Century Park East, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90067

February 28, 2022

payments. A plan that is not qualified provides no tax benefits. It is therefore false for Ms. Wagner to suggest that this was a “tax audit” unrelated to the qualification of the RJM Plan and the others reviewed. The chapter of the manual that governs IRS audits like the one the IRS conducted with respect to the RJM Plan makes clear that during such audits, the IRS examines the plans’ qualification status.

72. Further, the Wagner Rebuttal Report claims repeatedly that violations of the qualification requirements occurred that were clear on their face, and were of a massive scope and scale. For example, her Rebuttal Report states that there were “multiple of egregious uncorrectable violations” that were “pervasive” and “ubiquitous.” Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶¶ 15-16. As described *supra*, while she concedes on one hand that IRS audits seldom result in plan disqualification, Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶ 13, she nonetheless states that the violations in these cases were so extreme and widespread that all 193 Plans would be disqualified, Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶ 8. I do not believe it is credible to argue that the IRS overlooked such numerous and fundamental issues when auditing the RJM Plan; rather, the logical conclusion is that the IRS did not conclude that such violations had occurred.
73. This conclusion is bolstered by the actual audit correspondence. Among numerous other items, the IRS requested and received documents concerning “all sources of plan income (other than investment earnings)” (which would clearly include contributions and when contributions stopped, and transfers/rollovers) from the effective date of the plans through December 31, 2016 for the RJM Plan and several others. Reish Rebuttal Report ¶ 109 n. 14 (quoting Response to IRS’ September 13, 2018 Request for Information, dated October 4, 2018, WH_MDL_00356990); *see also id.* ¶ 112. The correspondence makes clear that the IRS was informed of the Plans’ effective dates. Reish Rebuttal Report ¶¶ 109, 111. The same correspondence also addressed “non-taxable” distributions from Roth (after-tax) accounts from the RJM Plan and another plan. *See* WH_MDL_00356990. If the RJM Plan were not qualified, it could not distribute money as a tax-free rollover.
74. Similarly, and regardless of the Wagner Report’s claims to the contrary, the IRS requested and received monthly bank and broker statements from the RJM Plan from

2012 to 2016, including statements for the Plan account at Solo Capital, that provided the IRS with extensive details of the RJM Plan’s trading activity, including its purchases of Danish securities, the receipt of funds from payment agents following the trading in Danish securities, the fees it paid to Ganymede, and distributions the RJM Plan received from other plans pursuant to partnership agreements. Response to IRS’ February 4, 2019 Request for Information, dated February 25, 2019, WH_MDL_00357011; *see also* Reish Rebuttal ¶ 106.

- a. The Solo Capital account statements that the RJM Plan provided to the IRS include detailed lists of the Danish securities in which the RJM Plan traded, the dates on which the trades occurred, and the volume and price of the securities traded. WH_MDL_00524103; WH_MDL_00524103; WH_MDL_00524103. Thus, contrary to Ms. Wagner’s claim, the RJM Plan *did* “disclose[] to the IRS examiner” information regarding its “purchases of Danish stocks.” Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶ 10. Yet the IRS, having received this information, did not disqualify or take any adverse action against the RJM Plan.
- b. The monthly bank statements requested by the IRS and provided by the RJM Plan reflect deposits received from Goal Taxback Limited—which the RJM Plan explained in correspondence to the IRS represented “direct payment of proceeds from withholding tax refund claims to the RJM Plan,” WH_MDL_00357011 at 012, followed immediately by wire transfers of funds out to Ganymede. WH_MDL_00357011. In some months, the receipt of funds from the payment agent and the corresponding payment to Ganymede were the only transactions that occurred, and the amount paid to Ganymede was equal to 68% of the money received from the payment agent. WH_MDL_00357083; WH_MDL_00357068. Thus, contrary to Ms. Wagner’s claim, the RJM Plan *did* disclose to the IRS examiner that “65 percent”—or more—“of the proceeds from dividend refunds” was “paid to . . . Ganymede.” Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶ 10. Yet the IRS, having received this information, did not disqualify or take any adverse action against the RJM Plan.

- c. Other bank statements show wire transfer inflows of funds from other plans. WH_MDL_00357083; WH_MDL_00357092; WH_MDL_00357099. The RJM Plan explained in correspondence to the IRS that these amounts were “paid to the RJM Plan by another partner in the investment partnership that acted on behalf of the partnership in receiving investment proceeds and paying out partnership distributions in accordance with the applicable partnership agreement.” WH_MDL_00357011 at 012. And, although not specifically requested, the RJM Plan also produced to the IRS 2013 and 2014 Schedule K-1 returns, which state the percentage of the RJM Plan’s interest in its investment partnerships and the amount of distributions received from those partnerships.⁵
 - d. Thus, the IRS was provided with documents indicating that the RJM Plan received payments from its partners representing the investment proceeds the RJM Plan was entitled to under its partnership agreement, and further that the amounts paid to the RJM Plan represented “the bulk of the proceeds remaining after Solo Capital’s and Ganymede’s fees to other members of the partnership.” Wagner Rebuttal Report ¶ 20. Yet the IRS, having received this information, did not disqualify or take any adverse action against the RJM Plan.
75. Subsequent correspondence includes further detail about the business activities of Mr. Markowitz and the various entities and the sources of contributions to the RJM Plan and several other plans. *See Response to IRS dated April 3, 2019.* Likewise furnished was additional information about the “contribution history” of the RJM Plan. *See Response to IRS dated April 9, 2019.*
76. As I previously noted in my Rebuttal Report [Section VII], the information summarized above would have been more than adequate to apprise even a neophyte IRS agent of fundamental qualification defects (if they were defects, which they were not) of the type alleged by Ms. Wagner relating to plan formation and investments in Solo Capital, including “permanency” (effective date and timing of contribution stoppage), the

⁵ WH_MDL_00524141; WH_MDL_00524142; WH_MDL_00524143; WH_MDL_00524144; WH_MDL_00524145; WH_MDL_00524146; WH_MDL_00524147; WH_MDL_00524148; WH_MDL_00524149; WH_MDL_00524150; WH_MDL_00524151; WH_MDL_00524152; WH_MDL_00524153.

practice. Stated plainly, the scope, scale and manifest nature of the violations Ms. Wagner alleges cannot be reconciled with the actual outcome of the IRS audit.

This Report is executed:

Date: February 28, 2022



C. Frederick Reish